

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Administrative Appeals Office
20 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., MS 2090
Washington, DC 20529-2090



**U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services**

(b)(6)



DATE:

APR 29 2015

A#:

PETITION RECEIPT #:

IN RE:

Petitioner:
Beneficiary:



PETITION: Immigrant Petition for Alien Worker as a Member of the Professions Holding an Advanced Degree or an Alien of Exceptional Ability Pursuant to Section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2)

ON BEHALF OF PETITIONER:



Enclosed is the non-precedent decision of the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) for your case.

If you believe we incorrectly decided your case, you may file a motion requesting us to reconsider our decision and/or reopen the proceeding. The requirements for motions are located at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. Motions must be filed on a Notice of Appeal or Motion (Form I-290B) **within 33 days of the date of this decision**. The Form I-290B web page (www.uscis.gov/i-290b) contains the latest information on fee, filing location, and other requirements. **Please do not mail any motions directly to the AAO**:

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Ron Rosenberg".
Ron Rosenberg
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The Director, Nebraska Service Center, denied the immigrant visa petition and the matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner describes itself as a wholesale business. It seeks to permanently employ the beneficiary in the United States as a product manager. The petitioner requests classification of the beneficiary as an advanced degree professional pursuant to section 203(b)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2).

At issue in this case is whether the beneficiary possesses an advanced degree as required by the terms of the labor certification and the requested preference classification.

I. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

As required by statute, the petition is accompanied by an ETA Form 9089, Application for Permanent Employment Certification (labor certification), approved by the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL).¹ The priority date of the petition is June 23, 2012.²

Part H of the labor certification states that the offered position has the following minimum requirements:

- H.4. Education: Master's in Business Administration (MBA).
- H.5. Training: None required.
- H.6. Experience in the job offered: None required.
- H.7. Alternate field of study: None accepted.
- H.8. Alternate combination of education and experience: None accepted.
- H.9. Foreign educational equivalent: Not Accepted.
- H.10. Experience in an alternate occupation: None accepted.
- H.14. Specific skills or other requirements: None.

Part J of the labor certification states that the beneficiary possesses an MBA from [REDACTED] completed in 2011. The record contains a copy of the beneficiary's MBA diploma and transcripts from [REDACTED] issued in 2012.³

The director denied the instant petition on October 3, 2013 and found that the beneficiary did not possess an accredited degree from a U.S. College or University.

On appeal, the petitioner states that neither the Act nor the regulations governing the EB-2 classification require an advanced degree from an accredited university. The petitioner disagrees with the director's cite to *Matter of Yau*, 13 I&N Dec. 75 (Reg. Comm. 1968) in denying the instant petition.

¹ See section 212(a)(5)(D) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(5)(D); see also 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(a)(2).

² The priority date is the date the DOL accepted the labor certification for processing. See 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(d).

³ We note that [REDACTED] changed its name in 2013 to [REDACTED], accessed March 31, 2015).

The petitioner's appeal is properly filed and makes a specific allegation of error in law or fact. We conduct appellate review on a *de novo* basis.⁴ We consider all pertinent evidence in the record, including new evidence properly submitted upon appeal.⁵ We may deny a petition that fails to comply with the technical requirements of the law may be denied even if the director does not identify all of the grounds for denial in the initial decision.⁶

II. LAW AND ANALYSIS

The Roles of the DOL and USCIS in the Immigrant Visa Process

At the outset, it is important to discuss the respective roles of the DOL and U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) in the employment-based immigrant visa process. As noted above, the labor certification in this matter is certified by the DOL. The DOL's role in this process is set forth at section 212(a)(5)(A)(i) of the Act, which provides:

Any alien who seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of performing skilled or unskilled labor is inadmissible, unless the Secretary of Labor has determined and certified to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General that-

- (I) there are not sufficient workers who are able, willing, qualified (or equally qualified in the case of an alien described in clause (ii)) and available at the time of application for a visa and admission to the United States and at the place where the alien is to perform such skilled or unskilled labor, and
- (II) the employment of such alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of workers in the United States similarly employed.

It is significant that none of the above inquiries assigned to the DOL, or the regulations implementing these duties under 20 C.F.R. § 656, involve a determination as to whether the position and the alien are qualified for a specific immigrant classification. This fact has not gone unnoticed by federal circuit courts:

There is no doubt that the authority to make preference classification decisions rests with INS. The language of section 204 cannot be read otherwise. *See Castaneda-*

⁴ See 5 U.S.C. 557(b) ("On appeal from or review of the initial decision, the agency has all the powers which it would have in making the initial decision except as it may limit the issues on notice or by rule."); *see also Janka v. U.S. Dept. of Transp., NTSB*, 925 F.2d 1147, 1149 (9th Cir. 1991). The AAO's *de novo* authority has been long recognized by the federal courts. *See, e.g., Soltane v. DOJ*, 381 F.3d 143, 145 (3d Cir. 2004).

⁵ The submission of additional evidence on appeal is allowed by the instructions to Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, which are incorporated into the regulations by 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(a)(1). The record in the instant case provides no reason to preclude consideration of any of the documents newly submitted on appeal. *See Matter of Soriano*, 19 I&N Dec. 764 (BIA 1988).

⁶ See *Spencer Enterprises, Inc. v. United States*, 229 F. Supp. 2d 1025, 1043 (E.D. Cal. 2001), *aff'd*, 345 F.3d 683 (9th Cir. 2003).

Gonzalez v. INS, 564 F.2d 417, 429 (D.C. Cir. 1977). In turn, DOL has the authority to make the two determinations listed in section 212(a)(14).⁷ Id. at 423. The necessary result of these two grants of authority is that section 212(a)(14) determinations are not subject to review by INS absent fraud or willful misrepresentation, but all matters relating to preference classification eligibility not expressly delegated to DOL remain within INS' authority.

Given the language of the Act, the totality of the legislative history, and the agencies' own interpretations of their duties under the Act, we must conclude that Congress did not intend DOL to have primary authority to make any determinations other than the two stated in section 212(a)(14). If DOL is to analyze alien qualifications, it is for the purpose of "matching" them with those of corresponding United States workers so that it will then be "in a position to meet the requirement of the law," namely the section 212(a)(14) determinations.

Madany v. Smith, 696 F.2d 1008, 1012-1013 (D.C. Cir. 1983). Relying in part on *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008, the Ninth Circuit stated:

[I]t appears that the DOL is responsible only for determining the availability of suitable American workers for a job and the impact of alien employment upon the domestic labor market. It does not appear that the DOL's role extends to determining if the alien is qualified for the job for which he seeks sixth preference status. That determination appears to be delegated to the INS under section 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b), as one of the determinations incident to the INS's decision whether the alien is entitled to sixth preference status.

K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 (9th Cir. 1983). The court relied on an amicus brief from the DOL that stated the following:

The labor certification made by the Secretary of Labor . . . pursuant to section 212(a)(14) of the [Act] is binding as to the findings of whether there are able, willing, qualified, and available United States workers for the job offered to the alien, and whether employment of the alien under the terms set by the employer would adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed United States workers. *The labor certification in no way indicates that the alien offered the certified job opportunity is qualified (or not qualified) to perform the duties of that job.*

(Emphasis added.) *Id.* at 1009. The Ninth Circuit, citing *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006, revisited this issue, stating:

⁷ Based on revisions to the Act, the current citation is section 212(a)(5)(A).

The Department of Labor (DOL) must certify that insufficient domestic workers are available to perform the job and that the alien's performance of the job will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of similarly employed domestic workers. *Id.* § 212(a)(14), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(14). The INS then makes its own determination of the alien's entitlement to sixth preference status. *Id.* § 204(b), 8 U.S.C. § 1154(b). *See generally K.R.K. Irvine, Inc. v. Landon*, 699 F.2d 1006, 1008 9th Cir.1983).

The INS, therefore, may make a de novo determination of whether the alien is in fact qualified to fill the certified job offer.

Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman, 736 F. 2d 1305, 1309 (9th Cir. 1984).

Therefore, it is the DOL's responsibility to determine whether there are qualified U.S. workers available to perform the offered position, and whether the employment of the beneficiary will adversely affect similarly employed U.S. workers. It is the responsibility of USCIS to determine if the beneficiary qualifies for the offered position, and whether the offered position and the beneficiary are eligible for the requested employment-based immigrant visa classification.

Eligibility for the Classification Sought

Section 203(b)(2) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1153(b)(2), provides immigrant classification to members of the professions holding advanced degrees. *See also* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(1).

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2) defines the terms "advanced degree" and "profession." An "advanced degree" is defined as:

[A]ny United States academic or professional degree or a foreign equivalent degree above that of baccalaureate. A United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree followed by at least five years of progressive experience in the specialty shall be considered the equivalent of a master's degree. If a doctoral degree is customarily required by the specialty, the alien must have a United States doctorate or a foreign equivalent degree.

A "profession" is defined as "one of the occupations listed in section 101(a)(32) of the Act, as well as any occupation for which a United States baccalaureate degree or its foreign equivalent is the minimum requirement for entry into the occupation." The occupations listed at section 101(a)(32) of the Act are "architects, engineers, lawyers, physicians, surgeons, and teachers in elementary or secondary schools, colleges, academies, or seminaries."

The regulation at 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(3)(i) states that a petition for an advanced degree professional must be accompanied by:

- (A) An official academic record showing that the alien has a United States advanced degree or a foreign equivalent degree; or
- (B) An official academic record showing that the alien has a United States baccalaureate degree or a foreign equivalent degree, and evidence in the form of letters from current or former employer(s) showing that the alien has at least five years of progressive post-baccalaureate experience in the specialty.

In addition, the job offer portion of the labor certification must require a professional holding an advanced degree. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(4)(i).

Therefore, an advanced degree professional petition must establish that the beneficiary is a member of the professions holding an advanced degree, and that the offered position requires, at a minimum, a professional holding an advanced degree. Further, an “advanced degree” is a U.S. academic or professional degree (or a foreign equivalent degree) above a baccalaureate, *or* a U.S. baccalaureate (or a foreign equivalent degree) followed by at least five years of progressive experience in the specialty.

At the outset, we note that [redacted] is accredited by the Bureau for Private Postsecondary Education (BPPE) in California. The Department of Education (DOE) notes that state approval is not the same as academic or professional accreditation, and that institutions approved to operate by a state, but that lack accreditation by a recognized agency, may not be recognized in other states and their degrees and credits may not be accepted. Only accreditation by a recognized agency assures national recognition (<http://www.ed.gov/international/usnei/us/accred-state.doc> accessed March 31, 2015). Here, the DOE clearly states that a degree from the [redacted] is not the same as an academic or professional accreditation. USCIS defines “advanced degree” as a U.S. academic or professional degree (or a foreign equivalent degree). Therefore in order for USCIS to recognize an advanced degree, the degree must be an academic or professional degree from an accredited U.S. College or University or its foreign equivalent. Thus, we find that the beneficiary’s MBA from [redacted] with state approval from BPPE is not the same as an academic or professional degree.

In the United States, institutions of higher education are not authorized or accredited by the federal government.⁸ Instead, the authority to issue degrees is granted at the state level. However, state approval to operate is not the same as accreditation by a recognized accrediting agency.

Further, according to the DOE, “[t]he goal of accreditation is to ensure that education provided by institutions of higher education meets acceptable levels of quality.”⁹ Accreditation also ensures the nationwide recognition of a school’s degrees by employers and other institutions, and also provides institutions and its students with access to federal funding.

Accrediting agencies are private educational associations that develop evaluation criteria reflecting the qualities of a sound educational program, and conduct evaluations to assess whether institutions

⁸ See <http://ope.ed.gov/accreditation>.

⁹ <http://www2.ed.gov/print/admins/finaid/accred/accreditation.html>.

meet those criteria.¹⁰ Institutions that meet an accrediting agency's criteria are then "accredited" by that agency.¹¹

The DOE and the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) are the two entities responsible for the recognition of accrediting bodies in the United States. While the DOE does not accredit institutions, it is required by law to publish a list of recognized accrediting agencies that are deemed reliable authorities as to the quality of education provided by the institutions they accredit.¹²

The CHEA, an association of 3,000 degree-granting colleges and universities, plays a similar oversight role. The presidents of American universities and colleges established CHEA in 1996 "to strengthen higher education through strengthened accreditation of higher education institutions."¹³ CHEA also recognizes accrediting organizations. "Recognition by CHEA affirms that standards and processes of accrediting organizations are consistent with quality, improvement, and accountability expectations that CHEA has established."¹⁴ According to CHEA, accrediting institutions of higher education "involves hundreds of self-evaluations and site visits each year, attracts thousands of higher education volunteer professionals, and calls for substantial investment of institutional, accrediting organization, and volunteer time and effort."¹⁵

The DOE and CHEA recognize [REDACTED] as the accrediting association with jurisdiction over California, where [REDACTED] is located.¹⁶ [REDACTED] website lists all accredited institutions within its jurisdiction, and [REDACTED] is not named as one of the accredited institutions.¹⁷ Therefore, [REDACTED] has not been accredited by a recognized accrediting agency.

While [REDACTED] is approved to operate in California by the BPPE, the fact remains that it is an unaccredited institution. The State of California acknowledges that "accreditation as an indication of the quality of education offered," and that institutions "must be accredited by an agency recognized by the [DOE] in order for it or its students to receive federal funds." http://www.cpec.ca.gov/x_collegeguide_old/accreditation.asp. California's Education Code states that approval to operate in California is granted after the BPPE has verified that the institution "has the capacity to satisfy the minimum operating standards." Cal. Ed. Code section 94887.

Accreditation provides assurance of a basic level of quality of the education provided by an institution as well as the nationwide acceptance of its degrees. A degree from a state approved institution that is unaccredited does not provide a sufficient assurance of quality. Therefore, since the beneficiary's MBA from [REDACTED] is not from an accredited institution of higher education, it does not qualify as an advanced degree within the meaning of 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(k)(2).

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Id.*

¹³ www.chea.org/pdf/Recognition_Policy-June_28_2010-FINAL.pdf.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.*

¹⁶ See <http://www.chea.org/Directories/regional.asp>.

¹⁷ See [http://\[REDACTED\]](http://[REDACTED])

We concur with the petitioner that *Matter of Yau* does not directly apply to the instant appeal.¹⁸ Nonetheless, for the reasons explained above, the beneficiary is not eligible for classification as an advanced degree professional based on a degree from an unaccredited institution.

After reviewing all of the evidence in the record, it is concluded that the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary possessed at least a U.S. academic or professional degree (or a foreign equivalent degree) above a baccalaureate, or a U.S. baccalaureate (or a foreign equivalent degree) followed by at least five years of progressive experience in the specialty. Therefore, the beneficiary does not qualify for classification as an advanced degree professional under section 203(b)(2) of the Act.

The Minimum Requirements of the Offered Position

The petitioner must also establish that the beneficiary satisfied all of the educational, training, experience and any other requirements of the offered position by the priority date. 8 C.F.R. § 103.2(b)(1), (12). See *Matter of Wing's Tea House*, 16 I&N Dec. 158, 159 (Act. Reg. Comm. 1977); see also *Matter of Katigbak*, 14 I&N Dec. 45, 49 (Reg. Comm. 1971).

In evaluating the beneficiary's qualifications, USCIS must look to the job offer portion of the labor certification to determine the required qualifications for the position. USCIS may not ignore a term of the labor certification, nor may it impose additional requirements. See *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1008; *K.R.K. Irvine, Inc.*, 699 F.2d at 1006; *Stewart Infra-Red Commissary of Massachusetts, Inc. v. Coomey*, 661 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981). USCIS must examine "the language of the labor certification job requirements" in order to determine what the petitioner must demonstrate that the beneficiary has to be found qualified for the position. *Madany*, 696 F.2d at 1015. USCIS interprets the meaning of terms used to describe the requirements of a job in a labor certification by "examin[ing] the certified job offer *exactly* as it is completed by the prospective employer." *Rosedale Linden Park Company v. Smith*, 595 F. Supp. 829, 833 (D.D.C. 1984)(emphasis added). USCIS's interpretation of the job's requirements, as stated on the labor certification must involve "reading and applying *the plain language* of the [labor certification]" even if the employer may have intended different requirements than those stated on the form. *Id.* at 834 (emphasis added).

In the instant case, the labor certification states that the offered position requires a U.S. MBA. No alternative education or experience is accepted. No foreign educational equivalent is accepted.

For the reasons explained above, the petitioner has not established that the beneficiary possesses an advanced degree.

The petitioner has not established that the beneficiary possessed the minimum requirements of the offered position set forth on the labor certification by the priority date. Accordingly, the petition must also be denied for this reason.

¹⁸ The holding of these cases pertains to the former Group II, Schedule A blanket certification regulations which specifically required a degree from an accredited U.S. college or experience or a combination of experience and education equivalent to such a degree.

Beyond the decision of the director, the petitioner has also not established its ability to pay the proffered wage as of the priority date and continuing until the beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 204.5(g)(2).

In determining the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, USCIS first examines whether the petitioner has paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage each year from the priority date. If the petitioner has not paid the beneficiary the full proffered wage each year, USCIS will next examine whether the petitioner had sufficient net income or net current assets to pay the difference between the wage paid, if any, and the proffered wage.¹⁹ If the petitioner's net income or net current assets is not sufficient to demonstrate the petitioner's ability to pay the proffered wage, USCIS may also consider the overall magnitude of the petitioner's business activities. *See Matter of Sonegawa*, 12 I&N Dec. 612 (Reg'l Comm'r 1967).

In the instant case, the petitioner did not provide any regulatory prescribed evidence covering the 2012 priority date. Further, the petitioner did not establish that factors similar to *Sonegawa* existed in the instant case, which would permit a conclusion that the petitioner had the ability to pay the proffered wage despite its shortfalls in wages paid to the beneficiary, net income and net current assets.

Accordingly, after considering the totality of the circumstances, the petitioner has also not established its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage to the beneficiary since the priority date of June 23, 2012.

Additionally, USCIS records provide that the petitioner has filed an additional I-140 petition on behalf of another beneficiary. Accordingly, the petitioner must establish that it has had the continuing ability to pay the combined proffered wages to each beneficiary from the priority date of the instant petition. *See Matter of Great Wall*, 16 I&N Dec. 142, 144-145 (Acting Reg'l Comm'r 1977).

The evidence in the record does not document the priority date, proffered wage or wages paid to each beneficiary, whether any of the other petitions have been withdrawn, revoked, or denied, or whether any of the other beneficiaries have obtained lawful permanent residence. With any further filings the petitioner must demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage to all of its beneficiaries as of the priority date and continuing until each beneficiary obtains lawful permanent residence.

Thus, it is also concluded that the petitioner has not established its continuing ability to pay the proffered wage to the beneficiary and the proffered wages to the beneficiaries of its other petitions.

¹⁹ See *River Street Donuts, LLC v. Napolitano*, 558 F.3d 111 (1st Cir. 2009); *Elatos Restaurant Corp. v. Sava*, 632 F. Supp. 1049, 1054 (S.D.N.Y. 1986); *Tongatapu Woodcraft Hawaii, Ltd. v. Feldman*, 736 F.2d 1305 (9th Cir. 1984)); *Chi-Feng Chang v. Thornburgh*, 719 F. Supp. 532 (N.D. Texas 1989); *K.C.P. Food Co. v. Sava*, 623 F. Supp. 1080 (S.D.N.Y. 1985); *Ubeda v. Palmer*, 539 F. Supp. 647 (N.D. Ill. 1982), *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 571 (7th Cir. 1983); and *Taco Especial v. Napolitano*, 696 F. Supp. 2d 873 (E.D. Mich. 2010), *aff'd*, No. 10-1517 (6th Cir. filed Nov. 10, 2011).

(b)(6)

NON-PRECEDENT DECISION

Page 10

III. CONCLUSION

In summary, the petitioner did not establish that the beneficiary possessed an advanced degree as required by the terms of the labor certification and the requested preference classification. Therefore, the beneficiary does not qualify for classification as a member of the professions holding an advanced degree under section 203(b)(2) of the Act. The petitioner also did not demonstrate its ability to pay the proffered wage from the priority date onwards. The director's decision denying the petition is affirmed.

The appeal will be dismissed for the above stated reasons, with each considered as an independent and alternate basis for the decision. In visa petition proceedings, it is the petitioner's burden to establish eligibility for the immigration benefit sought. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361; *Matter of Otiende*, 26 I&N Dec. 127, 128 (BIA 2013). Here, that burden has not been met.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.